arXiv:1609.00944v1 [math.RA] 4 Sep 2016

Armendariz Property on Weak IFP Ring

Sushma Singh and Om Prakash
Department of Mathematics
Indian Institute of Technology Patna, Bihta
Patna, INDIA- 801 103
sushmasingh@iitp.ac.in and om@iitp.ac.in

Abstract

In this work, we study about the ideals of a ring by introducing a new concept which combines the concept of Armendariz ring and weakly semicommutative (weakly IFP) properties of rings, called weak ideal Armendariz ring. It is a generalisation of ideal Armendariz ring. A number of properties of weak ideal Armendariz rings are established. It is proved that if N is a nil ideal of a ring R and $|N| = p^2$, then N is a commutative Armendariz ring without identity such that $N^3 = 0$. We also prove that R is weak ideal Armendariz ring if and only if $R[x]$ is weak ideal Armendariz ring if and only if $R[x; x^{-1}]$ is weak ideal Armendariz ring. Moreover, we have generalised weak ideal Armendariz by strongly nil-IFP and establish some of its properties.

AMS Classification: 16U80; 16P10; 16S50; 16U20.
Key Words: Armendariz ring, Reduced rings, Semicommutative ring (IFP), Weakly semicommutative ring (Weakly IFP), strongly nil-IFP.

1. Introduction

In this article, R denotes an associative ring with identity, otherwise it is mentioned and $R[x]$ is a polynomial ring over R in indeterminate x. For any polynomial $f(x)$, $C_{f(x)}$ denotes the set of all coefficients of $f(x)$. $M_n(R)$ and $U_n(R)$ denote the $n \times n$ full matrix ring and upper triangular matrix ring over R respectively. $D_n(R)$ is the ring of $n \times n$ upper triangular matrices over R whose diagonal entries are equal. We use e_{ij} to denote the matrix with (i, j)-entry 1 and elsewhere 0. Here, $\mathbb{Z}_n$ is the ring of integers (residue classes) modulo n and $GF(p^n)$ denotes the Galois field of order p^n. For general ring R, we use the symbols $P(R)$, $N(R)$ and $J(R)$ for prime radical, set of all nilpotent elements of R and Jacobson radical respectively. R^+ represent an additive abelian group $(R, +)$. Cardinality of a given set S denoted by $|S|$.
Recall that a ring R is reduced if it has no non-zero nilpotent elements. A right (left) ideal I of a ring R is said to have the insertion-of-factor-property (IFP) if $ab \in I$ implies $aRb \subseteq I$ for $a, b \in R$. A ring R is called IFP if the zero ideal of R has the IFP Property [3]. Shin [21] used the term SI for IFP, while Narbonn [19] called semicommutative ring. It is

obvious that subring of an IFP ring is IFP. From Birkenmeier, Heatherly and Lee [4], a ring R (without identity) is said to be 2-primal if $P(R) = N(R)$. The class of 2-primal rings is also closed under subring by Proposition 2.2 of [4]. It can be easily seen that IFP rings are 2- primal but converse is not true. Cohn [5], called a ring R is reversible if $ab = 0$ implies $ba = 0$. The class of reversible ring is closed under subrings and direct products from lemma 1.9 of [13]. Another generalisation of reduced ring is Armendariz ring due to Rege and Chhawchharia [20], which is defined as
A ring R is Armendariz if whenever $f(x)$ and $g(x) \in R[x]$ satisfies $f(x)g(x) = 0$, then $ab = 0$ for each $a \in C_{f(x)}$ and $b \in C_{g(x)}$.
It was Armendariz [[2], Lemma 1] who initially observed that a reduced ring always satisfies the above condition. Subring of Armendariz is obviously Armendariz. A ring R is called an abelian ring if every idempotent element is central. It is known that Armendariz ring is abelian. According to Kwak [10], a ring R is an ideal-Armendariz if R is Armendariz and IFP. He proved that [[10], Proposition 2.1] a ring R is Armendariz and IFP if and only if $f(x)g(x) = 0$ implies $aRb = 0$, for each $a \in C_{f(x)}$ and $b \in C_{g(x)}$. In 2007, Liang [18] introduced the concept of weakly semicommutative ring as if for any $a, b \in R$, $ab = 0$ implies $arb \in N(R)$ for each $r \in R$. By definition, it is clear that, any semicommutative ring is weakly semicommutative ring but converse is not true. It is shown that, for a reduced ring R, $D_n(R)$ is weakly semicommutative ring for $n \geq 4$ but it is neither semicommutative nor Armendariz.

In light of above study, we introduced the concept of weak ideal Armendariz ring as follows:

2. Weak Ideal Armendariz Ring

A ring R is said to be weak ideal Armendariz ring if R is an Armendariz ring and weakly semicommutative (IFP).
By definition, it is clear that every ideal Armendariz ring is weak ideal Armendariz but converse is not true. Towards this, we have the following examples:

Example 2.1. *Let F be a field and $A = F[a, b, c]$ be a free algebra of polynomials with constant term zero in noncommuting indeterminates a, b, c over F. Here, A is a ring without identity. Consider an ideal of $F + A$, say I, generated by cc, ac, crc, for all $r \in A$. Let $R = (F + A)/I$. From example 14 of [9], R is Armendariz but it is not a semicommutative ring because $ac \in I$ but $abc \notin I$. We denote $a + I$ by a. Now, we will show that R is weakly semicommutative ring. We have only three possibilities for the product of two elements in R is zero.*
Case(i) *when $ac = 0$, for $a, c \in R$, then $(akc)^2 = 0$ for each $k \in R$. Therefore, $akc \in N(R)$ for each $k \in R$.*
Case(ii) *when $cc = 0$, for $c \in R$, then $ckc = 0$ for each $k \in R$. Therefore, $ckc \in N(R)$ for each $k \in R$.*
Case(iii) *when $crc = 0$ for any $r \in A$, then $ckc \in N(R)$ for each $k \in R$.*
Thus, R is a weakly semicommutative ring.

Example 2.2. *(Infinitely generated case) Hamann and Swan [7], let F be a field and $S = F[A]$ be the free algebra generated by the noncommuting indeterminates $A = \{a_i\}_{i=0}^{\infty}$ over F.*

Let I be an ideal of S generated by $\{a_ia_ja_k|a_i,\ a_j$ and a_k are in $A\}$ and consider $T = S/I$. We identify a_i with $a_i + I$. Let $d_n = \sum_{i+j=n} a_ia_j$ and J be an ideal of T generated by $\{d_n \mid n = 0, 1, 2, 3 \ldots\}$.
We put $R = T/J$. It has shown in Example 2.1(2) of [14] that R is an Armendariz. Here, R is not semicommutaive because $a_0^2 = 0$ but $a_0a_2a_0 \neq 0$. Since $(a_0Ra_0)^2 = 0$, therefore, R is weakly semicommutative ring. Hence, R is weak ideal Armendariz ring which is not an ideal Armendariz.

Example 2.3. *Let $F[X, Y]$ be the free algebra over the field F with noncommuting indeterminates X, Y and I be the ideal $(X^2)^2$ of $F[X, Y]$. Consider the ring $R = F[X, Y]/I$ and $x = X + I$. Then by Example 1 of [8], $N(R) = xRx + Rx^2R + Fx$ and $P(R) = Rx^2R$ which contains all nilpotent elements of index two. We claim that R is weakly semicommutative ring. For this, let $a, b \in R$. If $ab = 0$, then $(ba)^2 = 0$, so $ba \in P(R)$. This shows that $bar \in P(R)$ and so $arb \in N(R)$ for each $r \in R$. Again, if $f(x), g(x) \in R[x]$ such that $f(x)g(x) = 0$, then $ab = 0$ for each $a \in C_{f(x)}$ and $b \in C_{g(x)}$ and therefore R is Armendariz ring. Hence R is a weak ideal Armendariz ring. Let $x = X + I$ and $y = Y + I$ in R. Then $(yx), x^3$ are also elements of R such that $(yx)x^3 = 0$. Meanwhile, $(yx)y(x^3) \neq 0$, therefore R is not a semicommutative. Thus, R is not an ideal Armendariz ring.*

Remarks:
(1) Every reduced ring is a weak ideal Armendariz ring.
(2) Subring of a weak ideal Armendariz ring is weak ideal Armendariz ring.
(3) If R is a reduced ring, then $D_3(R)$ is a weak ideal Armendariz ring.
(4) For any ring R and $n \geq 2$, $U_n(R)$ and $M_n(R)$ are not Armendariz by [12] and [20] respectively. Hence, they are not weak ideal Armendariz rings.
(5) In general $D_n(A)$ for $n \geq 4$ and A be any ring is not an Armendariz from Example 3 of [12]. Hence it is not a weak ideal Armendariz ring. But, when A is a reduced ring, then $D_n(A)$ is a weakly semicommutative ring.
(6) It has also observed that polynomial ring over weakly semicommutative ring need not be weakly semicommutative. But, the properties of weakly semicommutative ring with the Armendariz condition can be extended and studied for the polynomial rings.

Proposition 2.1. *A ring R is weak ideal Armendariz ring if and only if $R[x]$ is weak ideal Armendariz ring.*

Proof. We know that R is Armendariz ring if and only if $R[x]$ is Armendariz ring. In order to prove the result, we simply show that R is weakly semicommutative ring if and only if $R[x]$ is weakly semicommutative. For this, let $f(x)$ and $g(x) \in R[x]$ such that $f(x)g(x) = 0$. Since R is Armendariz, therefore $ab = 0$ for each $a \in C_{f(x)}$ and $b \in C_{g(x)}$. This gives that $arb \in N(R)$ for each $r \in R$, since R is weakly semicommutative ring. Therefore, $f(x)R[x]g(x) \subseteq N(R)[x]$. Moreover, in a Armendariz ring R, $N(R)[x] \subseteq N(R[x])$, hence $f(x)R[x]g(x) \subseteq N(R[x])$. Thus, $R[x]$ is weak ideal Armendariz ring. Also, R being subring of $R[x]$, converse is true. □

Proposition 2.2. *Let R be a ring and N be a nil ideal of R. If $|N| = p^2$, where p is a prime, then N is commutative Armendariz ring without identity such that $N^3 = 0$.*

Proof. If $|N| = p^2$, then N is nilpotent by Hungerford Proposition 2.13 of [10], since $J(N) = N \cap J(R)$.

Let N^+ be cyclic and say $N = \{0, a, 2a, 3a, \ldots (p^2-1)a\}$. Then N is commutative. In order to prove $N^3 = 0$, we show $a^3 = 0$ for $a \in N$. If $a^2 = 0$, then $N^2 = 0$. Suppose $a^2 \neq 0$. Then $a^2 = a$, which is not possible because a is a non-zero nilpotent element of N. To prove $a^3 = 0$, if possible, suppose $a^3 \neq 0$. Then the possibilities are $a^3 = a$ and $a^3 = a^2$. If $a^3 = a$, then $a^3.a = a^4 = (a^2)^2 = a^2$, which is impossible, since a^2 is non-zero nilpotent element. If $a^3 = a^2$, then $a^4 = a^3 = a^2$ and $a^4 = (a^2)^2 = a^2$, which is also impossible. In this way we find $\{0, a, a^2, a^3, \ldots, a^{(p^2-1)}\} = \{0, a, 2a, 3a, \ldots, (p^2-1)a\}$. Therefore, we have $(p^2-2)!$ number of cases to check to ensure $a^3 = 0$ in light of above equality of the sets. If possible, $a^4 \neq 0$, then either $a^4 = a$ or $a^4 = a^2$ or $a^4 = a^3$. If $a^4 = a$, then $(a^4)^2 = a^4a^4 = a.a = a^2$, which is a contradiction because a^2 is a non-zero nilpotent element of N. If $a^4 = a^2$, then $(a^4)^2 = a^4a^4 = a^2.a^2 = a^4 = a^2$, which is not possible. If $a^4 = a^3$, then $a^5 = a^4 = a^3$, which is impossible by above argument. Thus, $a^4 = 0$. Here, it has observed that in all $(p^2-2)!$ cases, among (p^2-2) elements of the set $\{a^2, a^3, \ldots, a^{(p^2-1)}\}$, one of element must be equal to $(p^2-1)a$ in each case. Now, if $a^2 = (p^2-1)a$, then $0 = a^4 = (a^2)^2 = ((p^2-1)a)^2 = a^2 \neq 0$, a contradiction. If $a^3 = (p^2-1)a$, then $0 = a^6 = (a^3)^2 = ((p^2-1)a)^2 = a^2 \neq 0$. Continuing this process, if we take $a^{(p^2-1)} = (p^2-1)a$ and squaring both sides, we get $(a^{(p^2-1)})^2 = ((p^2-1)a)^2$ and this implies $0 = a^{2(p^2-1)} = a^2 \neq 0$, a contradiction. Thus, we get $a^3 = 0$, entailing $N^3 = 0$.

Now, we prove N is Armendariz. Let $f(x), g(x) \in N[x]$ such that $f(x)g(x) = 0$. Then $f(x), g(x)$ can be written as $f(x) = af_1(x)$ and $g(x) = ag_1(x)$, where $f_1(x), g_1(x) \in \mathbb{Z}_{p^2}[x]$. But, we know that $\mathbb{Z}_{p^2}$ is Armendariz by Proposition 2.1 of [20]. Therefore, $\gamma\delta = 0$, for each $\gamma \in C_{f(x)}$ and $\delta \in C_{g(x)}$. Hence N is Armendariz ring.
If N^+ is noncyclic. Then by Theorem 2.3.3 of [15], there is a basis $\{a, b\}$ for N such that $char\ a = char\ b = p$ and one of the following condition holds:
(i) $a^2 = b^2 = ab = ba = 0$ (ii) $a^2 = b, a^3 = 0$.
Thus $N^3 = 0$. Now we will show N is a Armendariz ring. Let $f(x), g(x) \in N[x]$ such that $f(x)g(x) = 0$. If N satisfies the case (i) $a^2 = b^2 = ab = ba = 0$, then $N = \{0, a, 2a, \ldots, (p-1)a, b, 2b, \ldots, (p-1)b, a+b, a+2b, \ldots, a+(p-1)b, 2a+b, 2a+2b, \ldots, 2a+(p-1)b, \ldots, (p-1)a+b, (p-1)a+2b, \ldots, (p-1)a+(p-1)b\}$. In this case, $\gamma\delta = 0$ for each $\gamma \in C_{f(x)}$ and $\delta \in C_{g(x)}$, because product of any two elements of N is zero.
When N satisfies the condition $a^2 = b$, $a^3 = 0$, then $N = \{0, a, 2a, \ldots, (p-1)a, a^2, 2a^2, \ldots, (p-1)a^2, a+a^2, a+2a^2, \ldots, a+(p-1)a^2, 2a+a^2, 2a+2a^2, \ldots, 2a+(p-1)a^2, (p-1)a+a^2, (p-1)a+2a^2, \ldots, (p-1)a+(p-1)a^2\}$. In this case, only possibility of product of two non-zero elements of N is zero when one of elements in the product from the set $\{a^2, 2a^2, \ldots, (p-1)a^2\}$. Here, we can write $f(x) = a^m f_1(x)$, $g(x) = a^n g_1(x)$ and $f(x)g(x) = 0$ when $m + n \geq 3$. Thus, $f(x)g(x) = 0$ implies $\gamma\delta = 0$, for each $\gamma \in C_{f(x)}$ and $\delta \in C_{g(x)}$. □

Proposition 2.3. *Let R be any ring and I be a reduced ideal of R. If R/I is weak ideal Armendariz ring, then R is weak ideal Armendariz ring.*

Proof. Let $ab = 0$ for $a, b \in R$. Then $bIa = 0$ for each $a, b \in R$, since I is reduced ideal of R. Again $ab = 0$ implies $ab \in I$. Since R/I is a weakly IFP, so $(aRb + I) \subseteq N(R/I)$. Therefore, $(arb)^n \in I$ for any $r \in R$. Moreover, $(arb)^n I(arb)^n I \subseteq I$ and this implies $(arb)^{n-1}(arb)I(arb)(arb)^{n-1}I = 0$. This shows that $((arb)^n I)^2 = 0$. Since I is reduced, so $(arb)^n I = 0$ and $(arb)^n \in (arb)^n I$ implies $(arb)^n = 0$. Therefore, $(arb) \in N(R)$ for any $r \in R$. Hence, R is a weakly semicommutative ring. Also by [9], R is an Armendariz ring. Thus, R is a weak ideal Armendariz ring. □

Given a ring R and a bimodule ${}_RM_R$, the trivial extension of R by M is the ring $T(R, M)$ with the usual addition and multiplication defined as

$$(r_1, m_1)(r_2, m_2) = (r_1r_2, r_1m_2 + m_1r_2).$$

This is isomorphic to the ring of all matrices of the form $\begin{pmatrix} r & m \\ 0 & r \end{pmatrix}$ with usual addition and multiplication of matrices, where $r \in R$ and $m \in M$.

Proposition 2.4. *For a ring R, the following are equivalent:*
(1) *R is a reduced ring.*
(2) *$R[x]/ < x^n >$ is a weak ideal Armendariz ring, where $< x^n >$ is the ideal generated by x^n for any positive integer n.*
(3) *The trivial extension $T(R, R)$ is a weak ideal Armendariz ring.*

Proof. (1) $\Rightarrow$ (2): By Theorem 5 of [1], $R[x]/ < x^n >$ is a Armendariz ring. Rest proof is obvious. (2) $\Rightarrow$ (3) and (3) $\Rightarrow$ (1) is obvious. □

Proposition 2.5. *Let R be a ring and K be an ideal of R such that every element of $R \setminus K$ is regular and $K^2 = 0$. Then R is a weak ideal Armendariz ring.*

Proof. By Proposition 3.7 of [14], R is Armendariz ring. To prove R is weakly semicommutative ring, let $ab = 0$ in R. Then $ab + K = K$. Since R/K is domain, so $a \in K$ or $b \in K$. Hence, $arb \in K$ for any $r \in R$, and hence $(arb)^2 = 0$, because $K^2 = 0$. Therefore, R is a weakly semicommutative ring. Thus, R is a weak ideal Armendariz ring.

□

Proposition 2.6. *Let S be multiplicative closed subset of a ring R consisting of central regular elements. Then R is weak ideal Armendariz if and only if $S^{-1}R$ is weak ideal Armendariz.*

Proof. It is known that R is Armendariz ring if and only if $S^{-1}R$ is Armendariz ring. To prove $S^{-1}R$ is weakly semicommutative ring whenever R is weakly semicommutative ring. For this, let $\alpha_i = u^{-1}a_i$ and $\beta_j = v^{-1}b_j \in S^{-1}R$ such that $\alpha_i\beta_j = 0$. Then $a_ib_ju^{-1}v^{-1} = 0$. Here, $u, v \in S$, so $a_ib_j = 0$. Since R is weakly semicommutative ring, therefore $a_irb_j \in N(R)$, for each $r \in R$. If $(a_ir_ib_i) \in N(R)$ with nilpotency n_i, then $(\alpha_i\gamma\beta_i)^{n_i} = 0$, where $\gamma = w^{-1}r_i$. This shows that $(\alpha_i\gamma\beta_i)^{n_i} \in N(S^{-1}R)$. Hence $S^{-1}R$ is weakly semicommutative ring.
We know that subring of weak ideal Armendariz ring is weak ideal Armendariz. Hence the converse is true. □

Corollary 2.1. *For any ring R, following conditions are equivalent:*
(1) R is weak ideal Armendariz.
(2) $R[x]$ is weak ideal Armendariz ring.
(3) $R[x, x^{-1}]$ is weak ideal Armendariz ring.

For a semiprime ring R, note that R is reduced if and only if $P(R) = N(R)$ if and only if R is semicommutative ring if and only if R is weakly semicommutative ring. Since, for a semiprime ring R, $0 = P(R) = N(R)$, therefore semicommutative ring and weakly semicommutative ring both are equivalent.

Proposition 2.7. *Suppose that R is a semiprime right Goldie ring. Then following statements are equivalent:*
(1) R is an ideal Armendariz ring.
(2) R is an Armendariz ring.
(3) R is reduced ring.
(4) R is semicommutative ring.
(5) R is weakly semicommutative ring.
(6) Q is ideal Armendariz.
(7) Q is reduced ring.
(8) Q is semicommutative ring.
(9) Q is weakly semicommutative ring.
(10) R is weak ideal Armendariz ring.
(11) Q is weak ideal Armendariz ring.

Proof. (1) $\Rightarrow$ (2): By definition it is clear that every ideal Armendariz ring is an Armendariz ring.
(2) $\Rightarrow$ (3) $\Rightarrow$ (4) $\Rightarrow$ (5) is obvious.
(5) $\Rightarrow$ (6) $\Rightarrow$ (7) $\Rightarrow$ (8): From Corollary 13 of [9].
(8) $\Rightarrow$ (9): From (4) $\Rightarrow$ (5).
(9) $\Rightarrow$ (10): Q is weakly semicommutative so is R (being subring). Moreover, Q is semicommutative, therefore, R is Armendariz by Corollary 13 of [[9]]. (10) $\Rightarrow$ (11): Since R is a semiprime right Goldie ring so Armedariz ring and weakly semicommutative both are equivalent and from Theorem 12 of [9], R is Armendariz iff Q is Armendariz ring. Hence the result.
(11) $\Rightarrow$ (1): It is obvious. □

For an algebra R over commutative ring S, the Dorroh extension of R by S is an abelian group $D = R \oplus S$ with multiplication given by $(r_1, s_1)(r_2, s_2) = (r_1r_2 + s_1r_2 + s_2r_1, s_1s_2)$, where $r_1, r_2 \in R$ and $s_1, s_2 \in S$.

Theorem 2.1. *Let R be an algebra over a commutative domain S and D be a Dorroh extension of R by S. Then R is weak ideal Armendariz if and only if D is weak ideal Armendariz ring.*

Proof. Let D a be weak ideal Armendariz ring. Since D is an extension of R, therefore R is also a weak ideal Armendariz ring.
To prove the converse, let R be a weak ideal Armendariz ring. Take $(r_1, s_1)(r_2, s_2) = 0$. Then $r_1r_2 + s_1r_2 + s_2r_1 = 0$ and $s_1s_2 = 0$.
Case 1. If $s_1 = 0$, then $r_1r_2 + s_2r_1 = 0$. This implies $(r_2 + s_2)r_1 = 0$, so $r_1(r_2 + s_2) = 0$, and hence by definition of weakly semicommutative ring $r_1R(r_2 + s_2) \subseteq N(R)$. Therefore, $(r_1, 0)(a, b)(r_2, s_2) = (r_1a + r_1b, 0)(r_2, s_2) = (r_1(a + b)r_2 + r_1(a + b)s_2, 0) = (r_1(a + b)(r_2 + s_2), 0) \subseteq N(R)$, Thus, $(r_1, s_1)D(r_2, s_2) \subseteq N(D)$.
Case 2. If $s_2 = 0$, then $r_1r_2 + s_1r_2 = 0$, so $(r_1 + s_1r_2) = 0$. This implies $r_2(r_1 + s_1) = 0$ and so $r_2R(r_1 + s_1) \subseteq N(R)$. Therefore, $(r_1, s_1)(a, b)(r_2, 0) = (r_1a + s_1a + r_1b, s_1b)(r_2, 0) = (r_1ar_2+s_1ar_2+r_1br_2+s_1br_2, 0) = (r_1(a+b)r_2+s_1(a+b)r_2, 0) = (r_2(a+b)(r_1+s_1), 0) \subseteq N(R)$. This implies $(r_1, s_1)(a, b)(r_2, s_2) \subseteq N(D)$. Hence, D is a weakly semicommutative ring. We know that D is Armendariz ring by Theorem 3.4 of [16]. Thus, D is a weak ideal Armendariz ring. □

Example 2.4. *Let D be a domain and R_1, R_2 be two rings such that $R_1 = \begin{pmatrix} D & D \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}$, $R_2 = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & D \\ 0 & D \end{pmatrix}$. It is easy to show that R_1, R_2 both are weakly semicommutative ring. Let $0 \neq A = \begin{pmatrix} a_1 & b_1 \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}$, $0 \neq B = \begin{pmatrix} a_2 & b_2 \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix} \in R_1$ such that $AB = 0$. Then $a_1a_2 = 0$ and $a_1b_2 = 0$. It is only possible when $a_1 = 0$. This implies $ACB \in N(R_1)$ for each $C \in R_1$. Hence, R_1 is a weakly semicommutative ring. Moreover, R_1 is a non-abelian ring because $e_{11}e_{12} = e_{12}$ and $e_{12}e_{11} = 0$ whereas $e_{11}^2 = e_{11}$.*
Similarly, we can prove that $\begin{pmatrix} 0 & D \\ 0 & D \end{pmatrix}$ is a non-abelian weakly semicommutative ring.

Also from Example 2.14 of [16], R_1 and R_2 both are Armendariz rings. Thus, R_1 and R_2 both are non-abelian weak ideal Armendariz rings.
Now we will see that the structure of minimal weak ideal Armendariz ring without identity.

Theorem 2.2. *Let R be a ring without identity. If R is minimal noncommutative weak ideal Armendariz, then R is of order 4 and isomorphic to $\begin{pmatrix} \mathbb{Z}_2 & \mathbb{Z}_2 \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}$ or $\begin{pmatrix} 0 & \mathbb{Z}_2 \\ 0 & \mathbb{Z}_2 \end{pmatrix}$.*

Proof. Let R be minimal noncommutative weak ideal Armendariz ring without identity. If $|R| \leq 3$, then R must be commutative, therefore $|R| \geq 4$. Then $|R| = 4$ by considering above example $\begin{pmatrix} \mathbb{Z}_2 & \mathbb{Z}_2 \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}$. If R is nil, then R is nilpotent and commutative by above proposition 2.2, which is not possible. Therefore, R must be non-nil and $|J(R)| = 0$ or $|J(R)| = 2$. If $|J(R)| = 0$, then R is also commutative by Theorem 3.4 of [11]. Therefore $J(R)$ must have cardinality 2. Thus by Theorem 3.4 of [11] R is isomorphic to $\begin{pmatrix} \mathbb{Z}_2 & \mathbb{Z}_2 \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}$ or $\begin{pmatrix} 0 & \mathbb{Z}_2 \\ 0 & \mathbb{Z}_2 \end{pmatrix}$. □

3. Strongly Nil-IFP

In this section we have introduced the concept of strongly nil-IFP which is the generalisation of weak ideal Armendariz ring. Towards this we have the following definition:

A ring R is said to be strongly nil-IFP if for any $f(x), g(x) \in R[x]$ such that $f(x)g(x) = 0$, then $arb \in N(R)$, for all $a \in C_{f(x)}, b \in C_{g(x)}$ and for each $r \in R$.

By definition, it is clear that weak ideal Armendariz ring is strongly nil-IFP but converse is not true.

Example 3.1 ([17], Example 3.2)**.** *Let $R = Z_3[x, y]/ < x^3, x^2y^2, y^3 >$, where Z_3 is a Galois field of order 3, $Z_3[x, y]$ is the polynomial ring with two indeterminates x and y over Z_3 and (x^3, x^2y^2, y^3) is the ideal of $Z_3[x, y]$ generated by x^3, x^2y^2, y^3. Let $R[t]$ be the polynomial ring over R with an indeterminate t. We consider $f(t) = \bar{x} + \bar{y}t$, $g(t) = \bar{x}^2 + 2\bar{x}\bar{y} + \bar{y}^2t$ in $R[t]$. Then $f(t)g(t) = 0$ but $\bar{x}\bar{y}^2 \neq \bar{0}$. Therefore, R is not an Armendariz ring, hence it is not a weak ideal Armendariz ring. But R is strongly nil-IFP, because for any $f(t)$, $g(t) \in R[t]$ if $f(t)g(t) = 0$, then $arb \in N(R)$ for each $r \in R$, $a \in C_{f(t)}$ and $b \in C_{g(t)}$.*

Proposition 3.1. *A ring R is strongly nil-IFP if and only if $U_n(R)$ is strongly nil-IFP.*

Proof. Since any subring of a strongly nil-IFP ring is also strongly nil-IFP ring. Therefore, if $U_n(R)$ is strongly nil-IFP ring so is R.
Conversely, let R be strongly nil-IFP ring. To prove that $U_n(R)$ is strongly nil-IFP, let $f(x) = A_0 + A_1x + A_2x^2 + \cdots + A_rx^s$ and $g(x) = B_0 + B_1x + B_2x^2 + \cdots + B_sx^t \in U_n(R)[x]$ such that $f(x)g(x) = 0$, where $A_i's, Bj's$ are $n \times n$ upper triangular matrices over R as below:

$$A_i = \begin{pmatrix} a^i_{11} & a^i_{12} & \dots & a^i_{1n} \\ 0 & a^i_{22} & \dots & a^i_{nn} \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ 0 & 0 & \dots & a^i_{nn} \end{pmatrix}, B_j = \begin{pmatrix} b^j_{11} & b^j_{12} & \dots & b^j_{1n} \\ 0 & b^j_{22} & \dots & b^i_{nn} \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ 0 & 0 & \dots & b^j_{nn} \end{pmatrix} \in U_n(R).$$

Then from $f(x)g(x) = 0$, we have $(\sum_{i=0}^{r} a^i_{pp}x^i)\ (\sum_{j=0}^{s} b^j_{pp}x^j) = 0 \in R[x]$, for $p = 1, 2 \dots n$. Since R is strongly nil-IFP, therefore $a^i_{pp}rb^j_{pp} \in N(R)$, for each p, for each i, j and for all $r \in R$. This implies $(a^i_{pp}rb^j_{pp})^{m_{ijp}} = 0$ for each p and i, j and for all $r \in R$. Let $m_{ij} = m_{ij1}m_{ij2}...m_{ijn}$.
Therefore, $(A_iCB_j)^{m_{ij}} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & * & \dots & * \\ 0 & 0 & \dots & * \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ 0 & 0 & \dots & 0 \end{pmatrix}$ and $((A_iCB_j)^{m_{ij}})^n = 0$, for each $C \in U_n(R)$ and for each i, j.
Therefore $A_iCB_j \in N(U_n(R))$ for each i, j where $0 \le i \le s$ and $0 \le j \le t$ and for all $C \in U_n(R)$. Thus, $U_n(R)$ is strongly nil-IFP. □

Corollary 3.1. *For a ring R, the following condition are equivalent:*
(1) *R is strongly nil-IFP.*
(2) *$T(R, R)$ is strongly nil-IFP.*
(3) *$R[x]/ < x^n >$ is strongly nil-IFP.*

Proof. (1) $\Rightarrow$ (2) and (1) $\Rightarrow$ (3) by above Proposition (3.1). Since R is subring of $T(R, R)$ and (1) $\Rightarrow$ (3), therefore (2) $\Rightarrow$ (3). (3) $\Rightarrow$ (1) it follows that subring of strongly nil-IFP is strongly nil-IFP. □

Proposition 3.2. *Let R be strongly nil-IFP. If $N(R)[x] = N(R[x])$, then $R[x]$ is strongly nil-IFP.*

Proof. Let $p(y) = f_0(x) + f_1(x)y + \cdots + f_m(x)y^m$, $q(y) = g_0 + g_1(x)y + \cdots + g_ny^n \in R[x][y]$ such that $p(y)q(y) = 0$, where $f_i(x), g_j(x) \in R[x]$. Write $f_i(x) = a_{i0} + a_{i1}x + \cdots + a_{iu_i}x^{u_i}$, $g_j(x) = b_{j0} + b_{j1}x + \cdots + b_{jv_j}x^{v_j}$, for each $0 \le i \le m$ and $0 \le j \le n$, where $a_{i0}, a_{i1}, \dots, a_{iu_i}, b_{j0}, b_{j1}, \dots, b_{jv_j} \in R$. Choose a positive integer k such that $k > deg(f_0(x)) + deg(f_1(x)) + \cdots + deg(f_m(x)) + deg(g_0(x)) + deg(g_1(x)) + \cdots + deg(g_n(x))$. Since $p(y)q(y) = 0 \in R[x][y]$, we get

$$\begin{cases} f_0(x)g_0(x) = 0 \\ f_0(x)g_1(x) + f_1(x)g_0(x) = 0 \\ \cdots\cdots\cdots\cdots \\ \cdots\cdots\cdots\cdots \\ \cdots\cdots\cdots\cdots \\ f_m(x)g_n(x) = 0 \end{cases} \qquad (*)$$

Now, put

$$\begin{aligned} p(x^k) &= f(x) = f_0(x) + f_1(x)x^k + f_2x^{2k} + \cdots + f_m(x)x^{mk}; \\ q(x^k) &= g(x) = g_0(x) + g_1(x)x^k + g_2x^{2k} + \cdots + g_nx^{nk}. \qquad (**) \end{aligned}$$

Then, we have

$$f(x)g(x) = f_0(x)g_0(x) + (f_0(x)g_1(x) + f_1(x)g_0(x))x^k + \cdots f_m(x)g_n(x)x^{(n+k)}.$$

Therefore, by $(**)$, we have $f(x)g(x) = 0$ in $R[x]$. On the other hand, we have $f(x)g(x) = (a_{00} + a_{01}x + \cdots + a_{0u_0}x^{u_0} + a_{10}x^k + a_{11}x^{k+1} + \cdots + a_{1u_1}x^{k+u_1} + \cdots + a_{m0} + a_{m1}x^{mk+1} + \cdots + a_{mu_m}x^{mk+u_m})(b_{00} + b_{01}x + b_{0v_0}x^{v_0} + b_{10}x^k + b_{11}x^{k+1} + \cdots + b_{1v_1}x^{k+v_1} + \cdots + b_{n0}x^{nk} + b_{n1}x^{nk+1} + \cdots + b_{nv_n}x^{nk+v_n}) = 0$ in $R[x]$. Since R is strongly nil-IFP ring, we have $a_{ic}Rb_{jd} \in N(R)$, for all $0 \leq i \leq m$, $0 \leq j \leq n$, $c \in \{0, 1, \ldots, u_i\}$ and $d \in \{0, 1, \ldots, v_j\}$. Therefore, $f_i(x)Rg_j(x) \in N(R)[x] = N(R[x])$ for all $0 \leq i \leq m$ and $0 \leq j \leq n$. Hence $R[x]$ is strongly nil-IFP. □

Corollary 3.2. *Let R be a ring. If $N(R)[x] = N(R[x])$, then the following conditions are equivalent:*

(1) *R is strongly nil-IFP.*

(2) *$R[x]$ is strongly nil-IFP.*

(3) *$R[x, x^{-1}]$ is strongly nil-IFP.*

Theorem 3.1. *Let R be an algebra over commutative domain S and D be Dorroh extension of R by S. Then R is strongly nil-IFP if and only if D is strongly nil-IFP.*

Proof. Let D be strongly nil-IFP. Since D is trivial extension of R by S. Therefore, R is strongly nil-IFP.
Conversely, let R be strongly nil-IFP. Let $f(x) = \sum_{i=0}^{m}(a_i, b_i)x^i = (f_1(x), f_2(x))$ and $g(x) = \sum(c_j, d_j)x^j = (g_1(x), g_2(x)) \in D[x]$ such that $f(x)g(x) = 0$ where $f_1(x) = \sum_{i=0}^{m} a_ix^i$, $f_2(x) = \sum_{i=0}^{m} b_ix^i$, $g_1(x) = \sum_{j=0}^{n} c_jx^j$ and $g_2(x) = \sum_{j=0}^{n} d_jx^j$. From $f(x)g(x) = 0$, we have $f_1(x)g_1(x) + f_1(x)g_2(x) + f_2(x)g_1(x) = 0, f_2(x)g_2(x) = 0$. Since S is a domain, therfore, either $f_2(x) = 0$ or $g_2(x) = 0$.
Case 1. If $f_2(x) = 0$, then from $f_1(x)g_1(x) + f_1(x)g_2(x) + f_2(x)g_1(x) = 0$, we have $f_1(x)g_1(x) + f_1(x)g_2(x) = 0$ and this implies $f_1(x)(g_1(x) + g_2(x)) = 0$. Since R is strongly nil-IFP, we have $a_iR(c_j + d_j) \subseteq N(R)$. Hence $(a_i, 0)(r, s)(c_j, d_j) = (a_i(r+s)c_j + a_i(r+s)d_j, 0) \in N(R)$ for each i, j and any $(r, s) \in D$. Thus, D is strongly nil-IFP.
Case 2. If $g_2(x) = 0$, then from $f_1(x)g_1(x) + f_1(x)g_2(x) + f_2(x)g_1(x) = 0$, we have $(f_1(x) + f_2(x))g_1(x) = 0$. Since R is strongly nil-IFP, therefore, $(a_i + b_i)Rc_j \subseteq N(R)$. Hence $(a_i, b_i)(r, s)(c_j, 0) = (a_i + b_i(r + s)c_j, 0) \in N(R)$, for each i, j and any $(r, s) \in D$. Thus, D is a strongly nil-IFP. □

Proposition 3.3. *Let S be multiplicative closed subset of a ring R consisting of central regular elements. Then R is strongly nil-IFP ring if and only if $S^{-1}R$ is strongly nil-IFP.*

Proof. Suppose R is a strongly nil-IFP. Let $P(x), Q(x) \in S^{-1}R[x]$ for $P(x) = u^{-1}p(x)$ and $Q(x) = v^{-1}q(x)$ such that $P(x)Q(x) = 0$. This implies $p(x)q(x) = 0$, and R is strongly nil-IFP, so $arb \in N(R)$, for each $a \in C_{p(x)}, b \in C_{q(x)}$ and for all $r \in R$. Therefore, $u^{-1}aS^{-1}Rv^{-1}b \subseteq N(S^{-1}R)$ for each $a \in C_{P(x)}, b \in C_{Q(x)}$. Hence $S^{-1}R$ is a strongly nil-IFP. □

Proposition 3.4. *For an ideal I of R, if R/I is strongly nil-IFP and I is nilpotent ideal of R, then R is strongly nil-IFP.*

Proof. Suppose $f(x)$ and $g(x) \in R[x]$ such that $f(x)g(x) = 0$. Then $\overline{f(x)g(x)} = \overline{0}$, therefore $(arb)^n \in I$ for each $a \in C_{f(x)}, b \in C_{g(x)}$ and for all $r \in R$, since R/I is strongly nil-IFP. This implies$((arb)^n)^m = 0$, because I is nilpotent ideal with nilpotency m. Thus, R is strongly nil-IFP. □

Proposition 3.5. *Let R be a finite subdirect sum of strongly nil-IFP rings. Then R is strongly nil-IFP.*

Proof. Let I_l, where $1 \leq l \leq k$ be ideals of R such that R/I_l is strongly nil-IFP and $\bigcap_{l=1}^{k} I_l = 0$. Suppose $f(x) = \Sigma_{i=0}^{m} a_i x^i$ and $g(x) = \Sigma_{j=0}^{n} b_j x^j \in R[x]$ such that $f(x)g(x) = 0$. This implies $\overline{f(x)g(x)} = \overline{0}$. Then there exist $s_{ijl} \in N$ such that $(a_i R b_j)^{s_{ijl}} \subseteq I_l$. Set $s_{ij} = s_{ij1}s_{ij2}s_{ij3}\ldots s_{ijk}$, then $(a_i R b_j)^{s_{ij}} \subseteq I_l$ for any l. This shows that $(a_i r b_j)^{s_{ij}} = 0$ for each i, j and for all $r \in R$. Hence R is strongly nil-IFP. □

Proposition 3.6. *Every semicommutative ring is strongly nil-IFP.*

Proof. It is well known that semicommutative rings are weak Armendariz. Therefore, whenever $f(x)$ and $g(x) \in R[x]$ such that $f(x)g(x) = 0$ implies $ab \in N(R)$ for each $a \in C_{f(x)}$ and $b \in C_{g(x)}$. It can be easily shown that $ab \in N(R)$ implies $arb \in N(R)$ for each $r \in R$. Thus, R is strongly nil-IFP. □

We next compute some basic form of minimal noncommutative strongly nil-IFP ring.

In [6] Eldridge proved that (1) a finite ring R with identity is commutative if $|R|$ has cube free factorization.

(2) If R is noncommutative ring with identity and $|R| = p^3$ then $R \cong \begin{pmatrix} GF(p) & GF(p) \\ 0 & GF(p) \end{pmatrix}$.

It is well known that a minimal noncommutative ring without identity contains 4 elements and up to isomorphism there are two such rings $\begin{pmatrix} 0 & GF(2) \\ 0 & GF(2) \end{pmatrix}$ and $\begin{pmatrix} GF(2) & GF(2) \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}$.

Example 3.2. *If we take, $R = \left\{ \begin{pmatrix} a & b \\ 0 & c \end{pmatrix} : a, b, c \in \mathbb{Z}_2 \right\}$ and $f(x) = A_0 + A_1x + A_2x^2 + \ldots + A_sx^s$, $g(x) = B_0 + B_1x + B_2x^2 + \ldots + B_tx^t \in R[x]$ such that $f(x)g(x) = 0$, where $A_i = \begin{pmatrix} a_{11}^i & a_{12}^i \\ 0 & a_{22}^i \end{pmatrix}$, $0 \leq i \leq s$ and $B_i = \begin{pmatrix} b_{11}^j & b_{12}^j \\ 0 & b_{22}^j \end{pmatrix}$, $0 \leq j \leq t$. Then from $f(x)g(x) = 0$, we have $(\sum_{i=0}^{r} a_{pp}^i x^i)(\sum_{j=0}^{s} b_{pp}^j x^j) = 0$, for $p = 1, 2$. This implies $(a_{pp}^i b_{pp}^j) \in N(F)$, since F is field. This shows that $(a_{pp}^i r b_{pp}^j) \in N(F)$ for each $r \in F$. This shows that $(A_i S B_j)^2 = 0$, for each $S \in R$. Therefore R is strongly nil-IFP.*

Corollary 3.3. *Let R be a ring. If R is minimal noncommutative strongly nil-IFP ring with identity, then R is of order 8 and it is isomorphic to $\begin{pmatrix} GF(2) & GF(2) \\ 0 & GF(2) \end{pmatrix}$.*

Next we study the structure of minimal strongly nil-IFP without identity.

Example 3.3. *Let D be domain and $R = \begin{pmatrix} D & D \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}$, $S = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & D \\ 0 & D \end{pmatrix}$ be two rings. Let $0 \neq f(x), 0 \neq g(x) \in R[x]$ such that $f(x)g(x) = 0$. Now we can expressed $f(x)$, $g(x)$ as*

follows:
$f(x) = \begin{pmatrix} f_0 & f_1 \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}$, $g(x) = \begin{pmatrix} g_0 & g_1 \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}$ *where* $f_0, f_1, g_0, g_1 \in D[x]$. *From* $f(x)g(x) = 0$, *we get* $f_0g_0 = 0$ *and* $f_0g_1 = 0$. *If* $f_0 = 0$, *then* $aRb = 0$ *for each* $a \in C_f$ *and* $b \in C_g$. *If* $f_0 \neq 0$, *then* $g_0 = 0$ *and* $g_1 = 0$ *and* $aRb = 0$ *for each* $a \in C_f$ *and* $b \in C_g$. *Thus,* R *is strongly nil-IFP. Similarly we can prove that* S *is strongly nil-IFP.*

Theorem 3.2. *Let* R *be a ring without identity. If* R *is minimal non-commutative strongly nil-IFP, then* R *is of order 4 and isomorphic to* $\begin{pmatrix} \mathbb{Z}_2 & \mathbb{Z}_2 \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}$ *or* $\begin{pmatrix} 0 & \mathbb{Z}_2 \\ 0 & \mathbb{Z}_2 \end{pmatrix}$.

Proof. Method of proof is same as Theorem (2.2). □

References

[1] D. D. Anderson and V. Camillo, Armendariz rings and Gaussian rings, Comm. Algebra 26(7) (1998), 2265-2272.

[2] E. P. Armendariz, A note on extensions of Baer and P.P.-rings, J. Austral. Math.Soc. 18 (1974), 470-473.

[3] H. E. Bell, Near-rings in which each element is a power of itself, Bull. Aust. Math. Soc. 2 (1970), 363-368.

[4] G. F. Birkenmeier, H. E. Heatherly and E. K. Lee, Completely prime ideals and associated radicals, in: S. K. Jain, S. T. Rizvi (Eds.), Proc. Biennial Ohio State Denison Conference (1992), World Scientific, New Jersey (1993), 102-129.

[5] P. M. Cohn, Reversible rings, Bull. London Maths. Soc. 31 (1999), 641-648.

[6] K. E. Eldridge, Order for finite noncommutative ring with unity, Amer. Math. Monthly, 75(5) (1968), 512-514.

[7] E. Hamann and R. G. Swan, Two counterexamples in power series rings, J. Algebra 100 (1986), 260-264.

[8] Y. Hirano, D. van Huynh and J. K. Park, On rings whose prime radical contains all nilpotent elements of index two, Arch. Math. 66 (1996), 360-365.

[9] C. Huh, Y. Lee and A. Smoktunowicz, Armendariz rings and semicommutative rings, Comm. Algebra 30(2) (2002), 751-761.

[10] T. W. Hungerford, Algebra, Springer-Verlag, New York, 1974.

[11] Y. C. Jeon, N. K. Kim and Y. Lee, Insertion-of-idempotents-property and abelian rings, preprint.

[12] N. K. Kim and Y. Lee, Armendariz rings and reduced rings, J. Algebra 223 (2000), 477-488.

[13] N. K. Kim and Y. Lee, Extension of reversible rings, J. Pure Appl. Algebra 185(1) (2003), 207-223.

[14] N. K. Kim, K. H. Lee and Y. Lee, Power series rings satisfying a zero divisor property, Comm. Algebra 34(6) (2006), 2205-2218.

[15] R. L. Kruse and D. T. Price, Nilpotent Rings, Gordon and Breach, New York, 1969.

[16] T. K. Kwak, Y. Lee and S. J. Yun, The Armendariz property on ideals, J. Algebra 354(1) (2012), 121-135.

[17] T. K. Lee and T. L. Wong, On Armendariz rings, Houston J. Math. 29(3) (2003), 583-593.

[18] L. Liang, L. Wang and L. Zhongkui, On a generalization of semicommutative rings, Taiwanese J. Math. 11(5) (2007), 1359-1368.

[19] L. Motais de Narbonne, Anneaux semi-commutatifs et unisriels anneaux dont les idaux principaux sont idempotents, in: Proceedings of the 106th National Congress of Learned Societies, Perpignan, 1981, Bib. Nat., Paris, 1982, 71-73.

[20] M. B. Rege and S. Chhawchharia, Armendariz rings, Proc. Japan Acad. Ser. A Math. Sci. 73 (1997), 14-17.

[21] G. Y. Shin, Prime ideals and sheaf representation of a pseudo symmetric ring, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. 184 (1973), 43-60.